



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 180
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/043,648	01/10/2002	Meng Chang Chen	08919-069001 / 05A-881219	6040
26161	7590	05/19/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			PITARO, RYAN F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/043,648	Applicant(s) CHEN, MENG CHANG	
	Examiner Ryan F. Pitaro	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 and 25-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 and 25-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20,25-35 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 35 recites the limitation "system" in line 1 of claim 35. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Response to Amendment

3. This action is in response to the communication filed 2/24/2006. In the Amendment claims 1-20 have been amended, claims 21-24 have been cancelled, and claims 25-35 have been added as new. This action is Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Godoy et al ("Godoy", "PersonalSearcher: An Intelligent Agent for Searching Web Pages").

As per claim 25, Godoy teaches a method comprising: assigning an energy value to each category of hierarchy of categories of web pages (Page 5 lines 22-31), the energy value of a category representing a user's degree of interest in the category, the energy value of a category being increased when a user accesses web pages belonging to that category (Godoy, Page 5 lines 22-31).

As per claim 26, Godoy teaches a method further comprising adjusting the hierarchy of categories based on the energy value of each of the categories, including splitting off a child category from a parent category in the hierarchy if the energy value of the parent category is above a pre-determined threshold, indicating that the user's interest in the parent category is above a certain threshold (Godoy, Page 5 lines 1-10).

As per claim 27, Godoy teaches a method in which adjusting the hierarchy of categories includes removing a child category from the hierarchy if the energy value of the child category is below a predetermined threshold, indicating that the user's interest in the child category is below a certain threshold (Godoy, Page 6 lines 14-29).

As per claim 28, Godoy teaches a method in which when the user accesses new web pages belonging to a category, the energy value of the category is increased based on cosine similarities between a category vector associated with the category and the new web pages, the category vector defining a topic of interest associated with the category (Godoy, Page 5 lines 12-31).

As per claim 29, Godoy teaches a method further comprising periodically reducing the energy value of each of the categories (Godoy, Page 5 lines 25-28).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-4,7,8,10-14,17,18,20,30-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Godoy et al ("Godoy", "PersonalSearcher: An Intelligent Agent for Searching Web Pages") in view of Chen et al ("Chen", "WebMate: A Personal Agent for Browsing and Searching") in view of Chakrabarti et al ("Chakrabarti", US 6,356,899).

As per independent claim 1, Godoy discloses a system for managing a personal view for a user comprising: a personal view constructor, which builds the personal view as a hierarchy of categories based on the topic page extracted by the proxy (Page 3 lines 17-21); and a personal view maintainer, which adjusts the hierarchy according to an energy value of each of the categories (Page 5 lines 22-31). However, Godoy does not explicitly disclose a proxy. Chen teaches a proxy, which tracks web pages that have been accessed by the user and extracts a topic page from the web pages (Column 3 lines 30-37). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the proxy for extracting web topics of Chen with the system of Godoy. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a way to more accurately monitor a user's actions. The modified Godoy fails to distinctly point out predefined categories. However, Chakrabarti teaches the categories in the personal view being selected from a group of predefined categories (Column 15 lines 1-40). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the predefined categories of Chakrabarti with the system of the modified Godoy. Motivation to do so would have been to avoid difficulties for the user in the form of retrieval and organization problems by using a familiar data structure.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Godoy-Chen-Chakrabarti discloses a method wherein the personal view constructor builds the personal view by

mapping the topic page into a selected category in a superset of categories and updating a corresponding category in the hierarchy (Godoy, Page 5 lines 22-31).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Godoy-Chen-Chakrabarti discloses a method wherein the selected category has a category vector that is most similar to a keyword vector of the topic page (Godoy, Page 5 lines 22-31).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 2, Godoy-Chen-Chakrabarti discloses a method wherein the corresponding category is an ancestor of the selected category in the superset of categories if the selected category is not in the hierarchy (Godoy, Page 5 lines 1-10).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Godoy-Chen-Chakrabarti discloses a method wherein the personal view maintainer periodically reduces the energy value of each of the categories (Godoy, Page 5 lines 25-28).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Godoy-Chen-Chakrabarti discloses a method wherein the personal view maintainer removes a child category from the hierarchy if the energy value of the child category is below a pre-determined threshold (Godoy, Page 6 lines 14-29).

As per claim 10, Godoy-Chen-Chakrabarti teaches a method further comprising a personal view display to display the hierarchy of categories (Chakrabarti, Figure 7).

Claim 11 is similar in scope to that of claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 12 is similar in scope to that of claim 2, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 13 is similar in scope to that of claim 3, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 14 is similar in scope to that of claim 4, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is similar in scope to that of claim 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is similar in scope to that of claim 8, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 20 is similar in scope to that of claim 10, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 30, Godoy-Chen-Chakrabarti teaches a system in which the energy value of a category represents a user's degree of interest in the category (Godoy, Page 5 lines 22-31).

As per claim 31, Godoy-Chen-Chakrabarti teaches a system in which the energy value of a category is increased when a user accesses web pages belonging to that category (Godoy, Page 5 lines 22-31).

As per claim 32, Godoy-Chen-Chakrabarti teaches a system in which when the user accesses new web pages belonging to a category, the energy value of the category is increased based on cosine similarities between a category vector associated with the category and the new web pages, the category vector defining a topic of interest associated with the category (Godoy, Page 5 lines 12-31).

As per claim 33, Godoy-Chen-Chakrabarti teaches a method in which the energy value of a category represents a user's degree of interest in the category (Godoy, Page 5 lines 22-31).

As per claim 34, Godoy-Chen-Chakrabarti teaches a method further comprising increasing the energy value of a category when the user accesses web pages belonging to that category (Godoy, Page 5 lines 22-31).

As per claim 35, Godoy-Chen-Chakrabarti teaches a method further comprising, when the user accesses new web pages belonging to a category, increasing the energy value of the category based on cosine similarities between a category vector associated with the category and the new web pages, the category vector defining a topic of interest associated with the category (Godoy, Page 5 lines 12-31).

8. Claims 5,6,9,15,16,19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Godoy et al ("Godoy", "PersonalSearcher: An Intelligent Agent for Searching Web Pages") and Chen et al ("Chen", "WebMate: A Personal Agent for Browsing and Searching") and Chakrabarti et al ("Chakrabarti", US 6,356,899) in view of Devaney et al ("Devaney", "Dynamically Adjusting Concepts to Accommodate Changing Contexts").

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Godoy-Chen-Chakrabarti fails to disclose a split operator for hierarchical nodes. However, Devaney discloses a method wherein the personal view maintainer splits off a child category from a parent category in the hierarchy if the energy value of the parent category is above a predetermined

threshold (Column 7 lines 36-47). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the split operator of Devaney with the system of Godoy-Chen-Chakrabarti. Motivation to do so would have been to reorganize the hierarchy to maximize category utility within the search space.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 5, Godoy-Chen-Chakrabarti-Devaney discloses a method wherein the personal view maintainer chooses the child category that maximizes a gain value (Devaney, Column 7 lines 36-47).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 7, Godoy-Chen-Chakrabarti-Devaney discloses a method wherein the personal view maintainer merges information of the child category with information of the child category's parent in the hierarchy (Column 8 lines 1-11).

Claim 15 is similar in scope to that of claim 5, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is similar in scope to that of claim 6, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19 is similar in scope to that of claim 9, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20,25-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2174

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F. Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Mondays through Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro
Art Unit 2174
Patent Examiner

RFP


KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100